DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 625 CS 005 705

AUTHOR Ashley, Susan R.; Fritzen, James D.
TITLE Good and Poor Reader Evaluation and Comprehension of Prose Passages.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 7-11, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Comparative Analysis; *Evaluative Thinking; Higher Education; *Reading Ability; Reading Comprehension; *Reading Processes; *Reading Research; Recall (Psychology)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research project was to investigate the assumption of equivalent evaluative skills in good and poor readers. The first goal was to test whether in fact good and poor readers were equivalent in their evaluative skills when not constrained by the reading process. The second intent was to provide a reading condition in which good and poor readers were forced to make overt evaluations while reading, yielding a comparison of good and poor readers' evaluative processes while reading. The subjects, 128 college students in introductory psychology courses, read and evaluated two folk tales. The results indicated that good and poor readers were equal in their cognitive-evaluative capabilities on the two stories. The results were less clear regarding how good and poor readers applied this ability while reading. It appeared that there was fairly high agreement between good and poor readers in their evaluations made while reading. Additionally, good and poor readers both expressed only moderate agreement between evaluations made while reading and those made after reading. (Author/FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED193625

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Good and Poor Reader Evaluation and Comprehension of Prose Passages

Susan R. Ashley
The Pennsylvania State University
College of Education

and

James D. Fritzen
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State University
Department of Psychology

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Susan R. Ashley
James D. Fritzen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The purpose of this study was to address one aspect of the reading process, specifically the comprehension process. The first goal was to test to see if in fact good and poor readers were equivalent in their evaluative skill when not constrained by the reading process, by having good and poor readers both evaluate two folk tales. The second intent was to provide a reading condition in which good and poor readers were forced to make overt evaluations of these stories while reading to allow comparison of good and poor readers evaluative processes while reading. Results indicated that these good and poor readers were equally capable in their cognitive-evaluative capabilities on these two stories. Regarding how good and poor readers apply this ability while reading the results are less clear. It seems that there is fairly high agreement between good and poor readers in their evaluations made while reading. Additionally, good and poor readers both expressed only moderate agreement between evaluations made while reading and those made after reading.

CS005705

Introduction

The ability to read is now commonly recognized as a necessity for successful functioning in modern society. A greater part of our primary education experience focuses on learning this skill, which provides individuals with a more accurate and precise means of communication. With the awareness of the primacy of the reading process, past research endeavors have come from both education in its desire to be more capable of teaching reading, and psychology in its recognition of reading being a basic human behavior warranting further understanding.

As the combined research efforts of these areas generated detailed knowledge as well a global theories regarding the reading process, it became apparent that the reading process itself needed to be decomposed into more specific subskills and studied from the different perspectives of these specific components. A basic point of division can be made between the sensory-perceptual processes and the conceptual processes. The sensory-perceptual process , called decoding, involves seeing printed material and assigning the most fundamental level of meaning to letters ar words. The comprehension process entails the more cognitive capability of integrating groupings of words into complete thoughts, first at the sentence level, and then for paragraphs or whole stories. This research project is directed at the second, comprehension process, and its role in individual reading abilities. Specifically, this experiment is an attempt to explore one possible difference between good and poor readers in terms of their ability to comprehend prose material. Literature relevent to the present study is reviewed below; including a theoretical background regarding the concept of comprehension and its' relationship to the reading process, current knowledge regarding good and poor readers, as well as literature providing the direct basis for

this research project.

Comprehension and the Reading Process. Gibson and Levin (1975, Chap. 3) suggest that no single model or theory of the reading process could be sufficient, in part because there are so many different types of reading, depending upon the reader's interests, purposes and the material itself. Alternatively, they offer two classes of models: information processing models in which information receives progressively higher levels of treatment, from sensation of the actual written print through to long-term memory and the assignment of meaning obtained from the original text, and analysis-by-synthesis models, in which meaning is actually constructed by the reader as the sensory percepts of the page are interpreted by the reader. Dooling and Christiaansen (1977) have outlined a constructive memory for prose within their more general theory of levels of encoding in memory. Here it is assumed that more abstract ideas are remembered better than concrete or detailed information. During the reading process the individual actively selects these more abstract components for greater processing, insuring a stronger memory code for them, and thus greater likelihood of recalling these more central ideas at some future time. Additionally, an individual's memory of a passage is also a function of what the reader himself knows; that each reader is likely to generate his own set of reasonable inferences regarding the information in the text, and these inferences are based upon the reader's knowledge of the world. Taken together, the reader's selection of more abstract text components, plus his inferences regarding text information, define the reader as an active participant in both the comprehension process during reading and in determing what will actually be stored in memory.

Another current line of reading comprehension research assumes that all prose texts have as their basis, formal structures that are highly

similar for each text type. These models are sometimes called linguistic models because they attempt to define the "grammars" of whole texts. Mandler and Johnson (1977) best summarize the assumtpions of these theorists. They feel that every short story consisits of idealized internal representations which are combined by typical relationships to form a common format called a "story schema", and these schemas facilitate the comprehension process during reading. Other authors have offered alternative names and somewhat divergent terminology in line with their particular variation of the basic model.

Characteristics of Good and Poor Readers. Golikoff (1975) not only offers a comprehensive review of research on good and poor readers, but does it from a perspective in agreement with this investigation's interest in the comprehension capabilities of good and poor readers. It is Golinkoff's basic premise that the extraction of meaning from the printed page is the primary goal of reading, and therefore the definition of the reading process is equivalent to the more basic comprehension capability itself. In presenting literature about good and poor readers, she divides this research into three areas corresponding to what she feels are the basic subskills of the reading process: decoding, lexical access, and text organization. Golinkoff concuded that poor readers are less capable of utilizing both their own cognitive capabilities and text components to the same advantage as good readers do. Additionally, they are less flexible in their skills both in terms of reading different types of text, and also meeting differing task requirements commonly encountered in various reading situations. On the other hand, good readers have a better awareness of what good reading comprehension is, and are more likely to know when it has occured.

The Johnson Eliminative Technique. When linguistic models of classification (such as those mentioned earlier) are used for the scoring of subject's recall of stories a more precise knowledge of what individuals remember is obtained beyond a basic word count. There is however, a potential disadvantage with this technique in that only a handful of raters determine how the story is to be parsed into its consituent parts. Like a transformational-generative grammar of sentences, these models offer a logical and consitent means of describing the component parts of a story, but they additionally hold the same questionable value in providing a basis for how individuals actually evaluate prose materials during the reading process. As Golinkoff (1975) points out, the phrase boundaries provided by surface structure serves to organize a text, and may therefore provide a better format for analyzing recall performance.

In line with this perspective, Johnson (1970) developed a technique for determining the basic units of a story-paragraph by groups of persons, which offers the potential of being more closely in line with the reading process. Johnson's technique evaluates the differential importance or value of segments of a prose passage with regard to the total meaning of the passage. A passage was first divided into "pause-acceptable" linguistic units by groups of subjects. According to Johnson, raters were told that the function served by pausing might be to breathe, emphasize the story, or enhance its meaning. These pauses were therefore hypothesized to be functional in nature and used while encoding and decoding prose material. After division into pausal units, three independent groups of raters were instructed to eliminate unimportant pausal units until only one quarter, one half, or three quarters of the original whole story remained. By tabulating how often each particular subunit was eliminated under each of these instruc-

tional tasks a "structural importance" rating could be assigned to each of these units. Other subjects were then given the original complete passage to read and recall. It was found that the frequency of a particular subunits being recalled was correlated with earlier structural importance ratings. The higher a unit's structural importance rating, the more likely it would be recalled.

It is probable that the techniques of the linguistic approaches and Johnson (1970) share a commonality in how and what their procedures are assessing. However, it is their unique contributions that are of significance in planning this research project. The linguistic approach points out the necessity that research on prose comprehension must take into account the material which is utilized. The fact that a good story has a logical structure warns against using prose material that is too contrived. Such material may not conform to an idealized story format, which is paramount for assessing normal reading and recall performance. Meyers and Bolderick (1975) give support to this assertion in finding a significant correlation between recall and the order in which paragraph-story parts were presented. The farther story units diverged from their natural story order, the poorer recall became. Likewise, Keiras (1978) found that manipulating the coherence of paragraphs resulted in lower performance in terms of accurate title choice, reading times and recall.

Thus the linguists have provided a rationale for the selection of research material when an investigation is intended to study reading and comprehension performance under natural reading conditions. Following the selection of adequate prose material, Johnson's eliminative technique offers a more objective method of parsing this material for experimental investigation of naturalistic reading and recall performance, and is particularly

suited for addressing one of the specific interests of this research project, as will be seen in the following discussion. Previous research on good and poor readers have always evaluated poor reader's performance in terms of what would be called normative evaluations, in other words from good readers or arbitrary evaluators.

Smiley et al. (1977), utilizing a modified Johnson technique with good and poor adolescent readers, found that good readers were sensitive across the full continuum of levels of importance in their recall of a prose passage. In comparison, poor readers showed sensitivity to only the few units of highest structural importance, with the majority of the passage receiving no differential treatment in terms of recall. Specifically, if the subunits are rated 1, 2, 3, 4; with 4 being of highest structural importance, good readers recalled significantly more 4 than 3, and 3 than 2, and 2 than 1 level units in agreement with Johnson's findings. In constrast to this, poor readers recalled signficantly more level 4 than 3, but showed no difference between level 3, 2, or 1 in terms of how many units of each of these levels were recalled.

In interpreting these findings a key similarity stands out between the results of Johnson (1970) and Smiley (1977), which deserves further attention. Specifically, Smiley et al. (1977) good readers performed in a manner like those readers in Johnson's study, both of these groups of readers being differentially sensitive to all levels of the text's structural importance. This factor suggests that both of these reading groups are generating similar importance decisions regarding individual prose units. However, poor readers in the Smiley et al. study seemingly are not processing the prose material in an evaluative manner similar to the good readers, since they expressed a different (lesser) sensitivity to the levels of importance. The overt

reading process in terms of comprehending words may be similar, but it would seem that poor readers are not sufficiently or accurately evaluating the importance of each prose segment relative to the total meaning of the passage as they carry out the normal reading process.

It is important to note that in this study, all results were based upon the evaluative judgments, and thus the determination of levels of importance, by good readers. The assumption here is that good and poor readers are both cognitively capable of evaluating written material, and the lower recall performance of poor readers is due to a deficiency in utilizing their evaluative skills while simultaneously carrying out the reading process.

The purpose of this research project was to investigate this assumption of equivalent evaluative skills of good and poor readers. Specifically, if good and poor readers carry out the same Johnson eliminative method used by Smiley et al., where explicit judgments are require, are poor readers generating the same evaluative judgments as good readers? In other words, are poor readers equivalent to good readers in evaluating and comprehending prose material? A second goal of this study was to provide an instructional reading condition for good and poor readers with the intent of encouraging poor readers to employ their comprehension-evaluative capabilities during reading.

Method

Subjects. One hundred and twenty eight subjects from an Introductory Psychology subject pool were selected for participation and received experimental credits towards their Introductory Psychology grade.

Materials. Two Japanese folk tales: "The Dragon's Tear's" and "How to Fool a Cat" were selected as the experimental prose passages because they

met a number of desired criteria. First, previous reserach employing variations of Johnson's parsing and eliminative technique have utilized a number of different passages (Brown and Smiley, 1977, Johnson, 1970, Johnson, 1974, Pichert and Anderson , 1977, Rickards and August,1975, and Smiley et al., 1977). "The Dragon's Tears" and "How to Fool a Cat" were first selected for use by Smiley et al. (1977) and Brown and Smiley (1977) and best fit the experimental needs of this study. Each passage conformed to a true story schema of the type discussed earlier regarding linguistic analyses, thus facilitating the normal comprehension and reading process. Secondly, Smiley et al. (1977) employed these two stories specifically with good and poor adolescent readers. By re-utilizing these same passages, direct comparison could be made between the results found by Smiley et al., and those obtained in this study regarding the reading and recall preformance of good and poor readers.

According to previous evaluations made by Brown and Smiley (1977) "The Dragon's Tears" and "How to Fool a Cat" were found to be of comparable readability levels (Dale-Chale readability scores of 5.2287 and 5.3682 respectively) and are also approximately equal in length (390 and 403 words). The present study employed the same pausal units determined by Brown and Smiley, in agreement with Johnson's (1970) criteria of pause-acceptability of units. The two stories also had comparable numbers of pausal units: 59 for the Dragon story and 54 for the Cat story.

In order to determine groups of good versus poor readers, Level 3 (Form F) of the Iowa Silent Reading Test was administered under a group testing condition. Level 3 is designed and normed for academically accelerated eleventh- and twelfth-graders and college students. Only Test 2 Part A of the total form was utilized, since it specifically assesses reading compre-

hension on five short passages entailing a total of 42 multiple choice questions. Total time to administer this subtest was 25 minutes. Obtained reading scores ranged from 9 - 40, with a mean of 24.78 and a standard deviation of 6.96. Poor readers were defined as those having a score of 22 or lower, and good readers were determined by having a score of 30 or better. These criteria defined a three way split of the total 279 subjects given the Iowa Silent Reading Test, with 31.54% defined a poor readers, 43.74% as good readers and 33.69% within the 23 -29 median, or average reading score range. The good reader group had a mean score of 32.93 and a standard deviation of 4.09, while the poor reader groups had a mean score of 18.80 and a standard deviation of 2.97. Subjects falling within either the good or poor reading groups were then randomly selected for further experimental participation.

Procedure. The design of the experiment was a completely randomized 2 X 2 X 2 factorial analysis, consisting of the independent variables: prose passages, reading abilities, and reading conditions. There were two prose passages employed; "How to Fool a Cat" and "The Dragon's Tears". Reading ability was dichotomized into two groups; good readers and poor readers.

The experimental session consisted of two parts: The read and recall phase and rating phase. During the reading phase subjects were presented one of the stories typed double-spaced on a 9 X 11 sheet of paper. The story was typed such that there was one story unit per line. Prior to receiving the actual story they would be responsible for recalling, subjects were given a short trial paragraph typed in the same format as the actual stories. This allowed subjects the opportunity to become comfortable with reading this experimental typed format out loud. Subjects were then

instructed to read the experimental passage aloud and told that they would later be asked to recall the story. Immediately after reading the story, the subjects were asked to produce a detailed written recall, however, this aspect of the study will not be addressed in this article.

During this first phase reading and recall, subjects under the experimental condition were required to make overt evaluations of each pausal unit's importance or value in understanding the meaning of the total passage as they read the story. This was done by having each subject make a written evaluation of each pausal unit after it had been read, and before they started to read the next unit of the story. Specifically, they were told to place either a H, M, or L at the end of each pausal unit immediately after it had been read, these letters signifying a high, medium, or low importance value for each particulr unit just read. Both reading time and recall performance were timed for later analyses.

During the second phase, subjects were presented the second story typed double-space on a 9 X 11 sheet of paper, one pause acceptable unit per line. Subjects were told to read the story silently and then carry out a modified Johnson eliminative technique devised and used by Smiley et al. (1977) and Brown and Smiley (1977), to determine the levels of importance of the pause units as follows. First, subjects determined and eliminated an initial fourth of the passages units that were considered least important to understanding the total meaning of the story. They were then asked to eliminate the next fourth, then a third quarter of the passage, thus assuming the remaining fourth of the units to be of highest structural importance. This procedure generated 32 ratings for both good and poor readers on both stories. The whole experimental procedure took apporximately 45 minutes.

Results

During phase two of the experiment, four sets of structural importance ratings were determined from the eliminative technique with both of the two stories being rated by both good and poor readers. These will be termed the standard ratings of the stories. Each of these four groups of data received the same treatment as is outlined below. Depending on what stage in the eliminative process a pausal unit was deleted, it was assigned a score of one, two, three or four, this being done for each subject's story evaluation. A one was assigned to those units deleted first, a two to the next quarter of units deleted, a three for the third group of units deleted, and a four to the one quarter remaining units (highest importance). These scores of one through four were then averaged across each pausal unit for all 32 subjects in each group. The resultant averaged scores were then placed in rank order from highest to lowest structural importance. This data treatment was applied to the four groups of 32 subjects each, giving four structural importance rank orderings: good readers importance rank orderings of both stories and poor readers importance rankings of both stories. In addition the same rank ordering procedure was applied to raw data obtained for Smiley et al. (1977) for their eliminative technique with Introductory Psychology Students (27 subjects for the Dragon story and 34 for the Cat story).

Multiple comparisons were made amoung these six rank orderings using the Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient (r_s). Comparisons of good readers to poor readers, good readers to Smiley et al. readers, and poor readers to Smiley et al. readers were made for those rankings on each story. These correlations are given in Table 1.

For the Cat story, good readers and poor readers were correlated

.93, t (52) = 18.27, $p < .001$. Good readers and Smiley et al. readers were correlated .90, t (52) = 14.89, $p < .001$, while poor readers and Smiley readers were correlated .90, t (52) = 14.89, $p < .001$. For the Dragon story, similar correlations were obtained. Good readers and poor readers correlated .96, t (57) = 22.97, $p < .001$. Good readers and Smiley readers correlated .96, t (57) = 25.85, $p < .001$, and poor readers and Smiley readers correlated .92, t (57) = 17.72, $p < .001$.

Phase I high, medium and low importance ratings given by good and poor readers under the experimental conditions, termed concurrent ratings, were transformed into numerical values of 3, 2, and 1 respectively. These numerical values were then subjected to the same treatment as described above for the standard ratings. Ratings were averaged across all subjects for each pausal unit, and rank orders generated for all four groups (good and poor ratings for both the Cat and the Dragon story). These four rank orderings of concurrent ratings were then compared with themselves and also compared to the rank orders of standard ratings obtained during phase II. A Spearman Rank Correlation Coeficient (r_s) was again employed to make these comparisons between rank orders.

First comparisons were made between good and poor readers' concurrent ratings for each story (see Table 2). The correlation between the ratings of good and poor readers was .90, t (52) = 14.83, $p < .001$ for the Cat story, and .87, t (57) = 13.22, $p < .001$ for the Dragon story. Thus, the ratings of good and poor readers are strongly correlated both when reading as well as when made during the standard rating situation.

Second, concurrent ratings were compared to standard ratings within good readers and also within poor readers for both stories. These values are provided in Table 3. Good readers' concurrent ratings and standard

ratings correlted .75, t (52) = 7.93, $p < .001$ for the Cat story, and .56, t (57) = 46.26, p .001 for the Dragon story. Correlation coefficients for the poor readers' concurrent compared to standard ratings were .69, t (52) = 6.87, $p < .001$ for the Cat story and .61, t 957) = 5.81, $p < .001$ for the Dragon story. In summary it seems that the correlation of concurrent and standard ratings were moderate for both good and poor readers.

Finally, analyses were performed on an individual subject basis. For each subject, the concurrent ratings of that subject were compared with the mean standard ratings across individual pausal units. Of the total 64 subjects, all but six concurrent ratings correlated significantly with the standard ratings, with significance levels of at least .05 or better. Two good and three poor readers concurrent ratings of the Dragon story were not significnatly correlated with the standard ratings, as well as one poor reader's concurrent rating of the Cat story. For the Dragon story concurrent compared to standard ratings had a average correlation of .33 for the good readers and .37 for the poor readers, while for the Cat story the average correlations were .51 and .49 for good and poor readers respectively (see Table 4). Thus, although the correlation between concurrent and standard ratings were moderatley high when the ratings consisited of group averages, the ratings of individuals showed an appreciable amount of scatter, in some cases failing to indicate a significant correlation.

Although subject recall performance is not the focus of this article, it is intersting to note how rating evaluations correspond to recall. Recall performance was compared to concurrent and standard ratings using a Spearman Rank Order Correlation procedure. Specifically, mean concurrent and standard ratings for each pausal unit was compared to the mean percent recall of each pausal unit. It was found that recall was more strongly correlated with

standard ratings than with concurrent ratings. As seen in Table 5, for the Cat story, the correlation between the standard ratings and the recallability of the pausal units was .51 for the good readers, t (52) = 4.27, $p < .001$, and .47 for the poor readers , t (52) = 3.83. For the same story, the correlation between recall and the concurrent ratings was .21 for good readers t = 1.55, and .20 for the poor readers, t = 1.47. Pairwise comparisons of the correlations indicated that for the good readers the value of .51 was not significantly greater than the value of .21. Similarly, for the poor readers, the value of .47 was not significantly greater than the value of .20.

For the Dragon story, the correlation between the standard ratings and the recallability of the pausal unit was .65 for good readers, t (57) = 6.46, and .62 for the poor readers, t = 5.96. For the same story, the correlation between recall and the concurrent ratings was .32 for the good readers, t = 2.46, and .31 for the poor readers, t = 2.55. Pairwise comparisons of the correlations indicated that for the good readers the value of .65 was significantly greater than the value of .32. Similarly, for the poor readers, the value of .62 was significanlty greater than .31.

Discussion

As stated in the introduction of this paper, the first purpose of this research project was to investigate the question of whether good and poor readers are approximately equivalent in their cognitive capabilities of evaluating prose material. The question here is whether poor readers' typically lower recall performance are due to problems in the reading process per se, or if they suffer from a more general difference in their cognitive-evaluative capacity regardless of their reading ability. To test this hypothesis, this investigation had both good and poor readers perform a modified Johnson eliminative task on prose texts, to see when poor readers are not constrained by the ongoing reading process if they generated importance judgments similar to those of good readers.

Comparisons between standard ratings obtained for good readers, poor readers and earlier Smiley et al readers were extremely high, all reaching at least the .90 level for both stories. This result suggests that in terms of these stories, poor readers are equivalent in their cognitive ability to evaluate prose material when not constrained by the ongoing reading process. When poor readers were allowed unlimited time to evaluate a prose passage, they seemed to evaluate it in a manner similar to good readers, and generated ratings almost identical to those of good readers.

A second question of interest was whether there was any difference between good and poor readers in terms of the evaluation they made about the prose passages as they were reading it. Comparisons of the concurrent ratings made by good and poor readers again showed a high degree of agreement being .90 for the Cat story and .87 for the Dragon story. This finding is very intersting since it implies that poor readers are making evaluations of these prose texts that are nearly identical to the good readers, while

they are actually reading. However, it is still possible that good and poor readers might differ in whether they spontaneously employ such evaluations when they are not required to do so.

With the knowledge that these good and poor readers were equivalent in their cognitive evaluative capabilities, as expressed in the highly similar standard and concurrent ratings they generated, it was also of interest to see if the concurrent ratings obtained while reading were the same as standard ratings formulated when not forced to give an immediate evaluation as the passage was being read. Since good and poor readers were highly similar in both the standard and concuurent ratings they generated it would be expected that any differences between those sets of importance judgments would be expressed in the comparisons of these two ratings for both good and poor readers. This was precisely what occured. Overall, when the standard and concurrent ratings of good readers were compared, as well as the standard and concurrent ratings of poor readers, it was found that each individual set of comparisons were in moderate agreement. In other words, the standard ratings of good readers generally agreed with their concurrent ratings, and likewise, to approximately the same extent, poor readers' standard ratings were the same as their concurrent ratings on both stories. However, since the concurrent and standard ratings of both good and poor readers are far less than equivalent, ranging for .56 to .75 across stories and reading ability, it seems that the evaluations made during reading are somewhat different from those obtained under a standard rating procedure. One possible explanation for this occurance comes from Kintch and van Dijk (1978) and their macro-structure model of prose comparehension. These authors suggest that as readers progressively evaluate more propositions of a passage, they update and change their

evaluations of earlier propositions. Applying this hypothesis to these results, it could be argued that the concurrent ratings made early in these passages in fact subjectively change as the reader is exposed to more of the content of the passage. Therefore it is logical that those immediate and overt concurrent ratings used in the present analyses would be somewhat divergent from those obtained during the standard rating procedure.

Another line of support for this explanation comes from the correlations between recall performance and standard and concurrent ratings. These correlations reveal that there was a stronger (although not significantly so in all cases) correspondence between recall performance and standard ratings, ranging from .47 to .65, than between recall and concurrent ratings, ranging from .20 to .32. This again supports the notion that readers are probably updating earlier evaluations of units as they read, and the final set of subjective evaluations existant at the completion of reading the passage is fairly closely in line with ratings generated during standard rating procedures. It is also these final sets of evaluations, similar to standard ratings, that are used to later recall the story. From this interpretation it would be expected that recall would correlate more highly with standard ratings than concurrent ratings. Additionally, although good and poor readers do not appear to differ in either their concurrent or standard ratings, it might be hypothesized that good and poor readers do differ in terms of their ongoing revision process. An hypothesis such as this would argue that good and poor readers differentially update or change their evaluations of previous story components. However this theoretical possibility would be difficult to test.

In summary it appears that good and poor readers were seemingly equivalent in both the standard and concurrent ratings they generated. They also

showed a similar lower correspondence between the concurrent and standard ratings on each story. However, it is still an open question as to whether good and poor readers differ in their spontaneous evaluative behavior while reading, especially in terms of how they update evaluations of earlier story components. Comparisons between recall performance and importance ratings expressed similarities with both good and poor readers having a stronger correspondence between recall and standard ratings, than recall and concurrent ratings. A possible explanation for these results was offered based on Kintch and van Dijk (1978) and their macro-structure model of prose comprehension.

References

Brown, A.L., & Smiley, S.S. Rating the importance of structural units of prose passages: A problem in metacognitive development. Child Development, 1977a, 48, 1-8.

Dooling, J.D. & Christiaansen, R.E. Levels of encoding and retention of prose. In G.H. Bower (Ed.), The psychology of learning and motivation (vol. 11). New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Gibson, E.J., & Levin, H. The psychology of reading. Mass: M.I.T. Press, 1975.

Golinkoff, R.M. A comparison of reading comprehension processes in good and poor comprehenders. Reading Research Quarterly, 1975-1976, 11, 632-659.

Johnson, R.E. Recall of prose as a function of the structural importance of the linguistic unit. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1970, 9, 12-20.

Johnson, R.E. Abstractive processes in the remembering of prose. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1974, 66, 772-779.

Kieras, D.E. Good and bad structure in simple paragraphs: Effects on apparent theme, reading time, and recall. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1978, 17, 13-28.

Kintch, W.,& van Dijk, T.A. Toward a model of text comprehension and production, Psychological Review, 1978, 85(5), 363-394.

Mandler, J.M., & Johnson, N.S. Remembering of things parsed: Story structures and recall. Cognitive Psychology, 1977, 9, 111-151.

Meyers, L.S., & Bolderick, D. Memory for meaningful connected discourse. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory, 1975, 1,(5), 584-591.

Pichert, J.W., & Anderson, R.C. Taking different perspectives on a story. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1977, 69(4), 309-315.

Rickards, J.P., & August, G.J. Generative underlining strategies in prose recall. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1975, 67, 860-865.

Smiley, S.S., Oakley, D.D., Worthen, D. Campione, J.C., & Brown, A.L. Recall of thematically relevant material by adolescent good and poor readers as a function of written versus oral presentation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1977, 69(4), 381-387.

TABLE ONE

CORRELATIONS OF RANK-ORDERED RATING DATA

	Coefficient	t	Significance
Dragon Story			
Good to Poor	.95	22.97	.001
Good to Smiley	.96	25.85	.001
Poor to Smiley	.92	17.72	.001
Cat Story			
Good to Poor	.93	18.27	.001
Good to Smiley	.90	14.89	.001
Poor to Smiley	.90	14.89	.001

TABLE TWO

Correlations of Rank-Ordered Concurrent Rating Data

	Coefficient	t	Significance
Good to Poor			
Dragon Story	.87	13.22	.001
Cat Story	.90	14.08	.001

TABLE THREE

Correlations of Rank-Ordered Standard and Concurrent Ratings

	Coefficient	t	Significance
Dragon Story			
Good	.56	46.26	.001
Poor	.61	5.81	.001
Cat Story			
Good	.75	7.93	.001
Poor	.69	6.87	.001

TABLE FOUR

Average Correlation of Individual Subjects Concurrent Ratings with Mean Standard Ratings

	Dragon	Cat
Good	.33	.51
Poor	.37	.49

TABLE FIVE

Correlations of Ratings and Recall

	Concurrent	Standard
Cat Story		
Good	.21	.51
Poor	.20	.47
Dragon Story		
Good	.32	.65
Poor	.31	.62